

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claims 1, 6, and 9 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

I. Submission of Priority Documents

The Examiner noted that certified copies of KR2002-83720 and KR2003-13079 were not filed as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b). In response, the Applicants include herein certified copies of Korean patent applications KR2002-83720 and KR2003-13079 from the Korean Patent Office for the Examiner's consideration. Accordingly, the Applicants now believe that these patent applications are compliant under 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

II. Objections to the Claims

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: "...~~(e)~~ → (h) further comprises updating the highest priority..." In response, the Applicants amended claim 9 to replace the term "(e)" with "(h)" as suggested by the Examiner to correct the typographical error. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 9 are respectfully requested.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,667,984 B1 issued to Chao et al. (hereinafter "Chao"). To establish an anticipation rejection the Examiner must show that the cited reference teaches each element of a claim.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the elements of "each crossbar switch unit includes a buffer storing a predetermined sized cell" and "each output port uses *credit information that is status information of the buffer to independently arbitrate the cells*" (emphasis added). The amendment is supported, for example, by page 4, lines 12-14, and page 9, lines 8-13, of the Specification. In contrast, Chao fails to teach these elements. Instead, Chao teaches that the output arbiter sends a grant signal according the result of the dual round-robin arbitration scheme, but it cannot be discerned whether Chao uses "credit information" to accomplish this

task. See Chao, column 16, lines 41-45 and Fig. 11. As a result, Chao fails to teach the elements of “each crossbar switch unit includes a buffer storing a predetermined sized cell” and “each output port uses credit information that is status information of the buffer to independently arbitrate the cells” as recited in the claim. Thus, for at least these reasons, Chao fails to teach each element of claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 2 and 3 are patentable over Chao because of their dependencies on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 are respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 6, this claim includes analogous limitations to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, claim 6 is patentable over Chao. In addition, dependent claim 8 is patentable over Chao because of its dependency on claim 6. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 8 are respectfully requested.

IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0083326 A1 issued to Wang et al. (hereinafter “Wang”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2142.

In regard to claim 4, this claim depends on base claim 1 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, Chao fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 4. In addition, the Examiner has not cited and the Applicants are unable to discern any portion of Wang that teaches or suggests the missing elements. Thus, for at least these reasons, Chao in view of Wang fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 4. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao in view of Wang in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0150121 A1 issued to Van Wageningen et al. (hereinafter “Van Wageningen”).

In regard to claim 5, this claim depends on base claim 1 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, Chao fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 5. In addition, the Examiner has not cited and the Applicants are unable to discern the portions of Wang and Van Wageningen that teach or suggest the missing elements. Thus, for at least these reasons, Chao in view of Wang in further view of Van Wageningen fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 5. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao in view of Van Wageningen.

In regard to claims 7 and 9, these claim depend on base claim 6 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 6, Chao fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 7 and 9. In addition, the Examiner has not cited and the Applicants are unable to discern the portion of Van Wageningen that teaches or suggests the missing elements. Thus, for at least these reasons, Chao in view of Van Wageningen fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 7 and 9. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 9 are respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao in view of Van Wageningen in further view of McKeown “*The iSLIP Scheduling Algorithm for Input-Output Switches*” (hereinafter “McKeown”).

In regard to claim 10, this claim depends on base claim 6 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 6, Chao fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 10. In addition, the Examiner has not cited and the Applicants are unable to discern the portions of Van Wageningen and McKeown that teach or suggest the missing elements. Thus, for at least these reasons, Chao in view of Van Wageningen

in further view of McKeown fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 10. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207 3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: 10/3, 2007

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800


Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 3, 2007.


Melissa Stead

10-3-07
October 3, 2007